



## Facsimile Transmission

500 Grant Street, Suite 3100 • Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15219-2502 • (412) 391-3939  
Facsimile: (412) 394-7959  
mwjohnson@jonesday.com

January 14, 2008

**RECEIVED**  
**CENTRAL FAX CENTER**

**JAN 14 2008**

Please hand deliver the following facsimile to:

Name: **Examiner MengYao Zhe**

Facsimile No.: **571-273-8300**

Company: **United States Patent and Trademark Office**

Number of pages (including this page): **2**

Telephone No.: **571-272-6946**

From: **Matthew W. Johnson**

Send Copies To:

Direct Telephone No.: **(412) 394-9524**

JP No.: **JP010406**

☐ Copies distributed

CAM No.: **343355-600069**

Operator's Initials

Re: **Examiner Interview Agenda for Application Number: 10/674,749**

**NOTICE:** This communication is intended to be confidential to the person to whom it is addressed, and it is subject to copyright protection. If you are not the intended recipient or the agent of the intended recipient or if you are unable to deliver this communication to the intended recipient, please do not read, copy or use this communication or show it to any other person, but notify the sender immediately by telephone at the direct telephone number noted above.

**Message:**

Please call us immediately if the facsimile you receive is incomplete or illegible. Please ask for the facsimile operator.

ATLANTA • BEIJING • BRUSSELS • CHICAGO • CLEVELAND • COLUMBUS • DALLAS • FRANKFURT • HONG KONG • HOUSTON  
IRVINE • LONDON • LOS ANGELES • MADRID • MILAN • MOSCOW • MUNICH • NEW DELHI • NEW YORK • PARIS • PITTSBURGH  
SAN DIEGO • SAN FRANCISCO • SHANGHAI • SILICON VALLEY • SINGAPORE • SYDNEY • TAIPEI • TOKYO • WASHINGTON

***PROPOSED AGENDA FOR TELEPHONE INTERVIEW***

**Re: U.S. Patent Application Serial No. 10/674,749 entitled "Computer Implemented System And Method For Managing Service Agents"**

1. Assignee wishes to discuss the rejection of claim 1 with respect to the cited references. Claim 1 recites a first lock configured to operate as a dispatch lock for allowing only one requesting thread into a dispatch section at a time, and a second lock configured to operate as a service pool lock for synchronizing the requesting thread that is in the dispatch section with a service agent. Neither the Armstrong reference nor the other references disclose the two different locks required in claim 1 – that is, a dispatch lock and a service pool lock as required in claim 1.
2. Assignee wishes to discuss that the cited references do not disclose the use of service agents, let alone the use of service agents within the context of claim 1.
3. Assignee wishes to discuss that the cited references do not disclose that the dispatch lock and the service pool lock are nested as required in claim 2.
4. Assignee wishes to discuss the Section 112 rejections.

This list should not be construed as a complete listing of all issues/arguments in reference to the present office action.

CLI-1581793v1